

STAT

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release
2013/08/05 : CIA-RDP89-00066R000700090017-1

Page Denied

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release
2013/08/05 : CIA-RDP89-00066R000700090017-1

24 July 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: OMB Meeting Scheduled for Today Where the Senate's Supplemental Retirement Proposal Will Be Discussed

1. D/PERS advised me that the DCI's office called him that they had been informed that OMB was holding a meeting of the Domestic Policy Council (DPC) at 1400 hours today where, among other topics, Sen. Roth would discuss Sen. Stevens' proposed supplemental retirement plan (referred to as the Sen. Roth/Lehmann bill on the DPC agenda).

The DCI intends to attend this meeting to make the point that CIA requires a special plan that meets our special needs.

2. D/PERS had a number of questions (per telephone) from the DDCI and ExDir regarding our proposed plan - mostly clarifying as to "why" of such things as the 75% cap for CIARDS and the several "cost of proposed legislation" computations - specifically the aggregate costs of the proposal and the inclusion of item #6 as an option for reducing costs (item 6 is the imposition of a 2% reduction for early retirement).

D/PERS then provided them with the answers and told them that #6 was not something we were proposing but informational because it paralleled a primary provision of Sen. Stevens' plan which may be raised at the meeting. D/PERS reaffirmed that cost reduction option #1, 2 and 3 were our only "giveaways" if we had to do so.

3. D/PERS suggested to ExDir that the DCI should avoid getting into details of our proposal but if necessary refer to the "OMB/CIA" link of expanding special credit for all employees serving overseas and bearing the risk burdens, etc.

4. Apart from the above, D/PERS asked me if it might be better to specifically state in the funding/appropriation sections of our proposal that our moneys for the plan would be handled - budget wise - within the overall OPM retirement appropriations on CIA's behalf so as to lower the profile of our appropriations.

I stated that we probably should only use the generalized wording in our proposed legislation to fix the authority for such funding/appropriations and then make administrative arrangements with the Administration for OPM to handle our account. Putting specifics in our proposed bill may trigger involvement of the Congressional Budget committees, Governmental Affairs, Treasury, etc.

D/PERS question is a good one that we have discussed before. This should be studied closely because these are critical sections because of the potential for a very high-profile of the

CIA retirement appropriations every year and will surely raise questions within the Congress at large if we can't negotiate an administrative arrangement with OPM. It seems to me that we need to handle this issue along the lines we've worked out for certain other special appropriations.

STAT



STAT

Note: [redacted] were attending a meeting elsewhere in the building when D/PERS called me. I filled them in on the above when they returned. D/PERS subsequently called us together prior to 1400 hours to "stand-by" in case additional "briefing" questions came up. No further O/DCI queries arose by close of business.